

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

ADRIAN D. MADDOX,)	CASE NO. 1:12 CV 1828
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
)	
CITY OF SHAKER HEIGHTS, OHIO, et al.,)	Magistrate Judge William H. Baughman, Jr,
)	
Defendants.)	ORDER ON MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S
)	<u>REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION</u>

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation issued by Magistrate Judge William H. Baughman, Jr. (Docket #36), recommending that the Plaintiff, Adrian Maddox's Motion to Amend Complaint (Docket #23) be granted and that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration of Ruling on Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Docket #35) be denied.

On December 3, 2013, Plaintiff filed a Motion in Opposition to Report and Recommendation. (Docket #39.) On December 9, 2013, Defendants filed a Motion Opposing Plaintiff's Motion in Opposition to Report and Recommendation of Magistrate. (Docket #40.)

Standard of Review for a Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation

The applicable district court standard of review for a magistrate judge's report and recommendation depends upon whether objections were made to the report. When objections are made to a report and recommendation of a magistrate judge, the district court reviews the

case *de novo*. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b) provides:

The district judge must determine *de novo* any part of the magistrate judge's disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

Conclusion

This Court carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and the objections filed by the Parties and finds the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge to be well-reasoned and correct. The Court hereby agrees with and adopts the findings of the Magistrate Judge as its own.

The Report and Recommendation issued by Magistrate Judge Baughman (Document #36) is hereby ADOPTED. Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint (Docket #23) is hereby GRANTED. Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider (Docket #35) is hereby DENIED.

This case remains referred to Magistrate Judge Baughman for pretrial supervision.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


DONALD C. NUGENT
United States District Judge

DATED: December 16, 2013